

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and further examination are requested.

I. Amendments to the Claims

Independent claims 1, 11, 14 and 15 have been amended to make a number of minor editorial revisions thereto. These editorial revisions have been made to place the claims in better U.S. form. These editorial revisions do not add new matter. Further, these editorial revisions have not been made to narrow the scope of protection of the claims, or to address issues related to patentability, and therefore, these amendments should not be construed as limiting the scope of equivalents of the claimed features offered by the Doctrine of Equivalents.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1, 3-5, 8-10 and 16-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Knee and Sampsell. In addition, claims 11, 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Hendricks and Sampsell. Further, claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Hendricks, Sampsell and Krzyzanowski. These rejections are believed clearly inapplicable to independent claims 1, 11, 14 and 15 and the claims that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites an apparatus that includes (a) an operation receiving unit (having an operational button for receiving a user operation from a user) that regards a detection of the user pushing the operational button as a first user operation and that regards a detection of the

operational button being released, after the detection of the user pushing the operational button,
as a second user operation. In addition, claim 1 recites that the apparatus includes (b) a requesting unit for transmitting (to a program selecting apparatus) a signal for requesting a piece of reception information that corresponds to a program selected according to the first user operation, the signal is transmitted when the first user operation has been received. Moreover, claim 1 recites that the apparatus includes (c) a forwarding unit for transmitting the piece of reception information requested and received from the program selecting apparatus, the piece of reception information is transmitted after the second user operation has been received.

The above-described structure required by distinguishing limitations (a)-(c) allows the user to easily forward the piece of reception information of the selected program to another apparatus. As recited in claim 1, this forwarding is achieved by performing the first user operation (pushing the operational button of the apparatus) to cause the apparatus to receive the piece of reception information of the selected program from the program selecting apparatus, and then performing the second user operation (releasing the operational button of the informing unit).

Initially, please note that the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection acknowledges that Knee fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing limitations (a)-(c), as recited in claim 1 (see pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action). In light of the above, this rejection relies on Sampsell for teaching these features which are admittedly lacking from Knee.

However, Sampsell merely teaches that first a user presses a “learning activator” button on a learning remote, second the learning remote receives and stores an original command from an original (different) remote, third the learning remote notifies the user of the status of the storage of the original command, fourth the user deactivates the learning mode using the keypad

of the learning remote, and fifth the user presses a button on the learning remote to utilize the original command (see paragraphs [0055] and [0056] as cited in the Office Action).

Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that Sampsell teaches that the learning button of the learning remote is pressed, the original command is received from another remote, and the learning remote notifies the user that the original command has been stored, but fails to disclose or suggest forwarding the piece of reception information of the selected program to another apparatus by performing the first user operation (pushing the operational button of the apparatus) to cause the apparatus to receive the piece of reception information of the selected program from the program selecting apparatus, and then performing the second user operation (releasing the operational button of the informing unit), as required by claim 1.

In other words, even though Sampsell teaches that the user is notified when the original command is received from the original remote and stored, Sampsell still fails to disclose or suggest that (i) the operation receiving unit detects the user pushing the button as a first user operation, (ii) in response to the first user operation, the requesting unit transmits a signal requesting the piece of reception information corresponding to the program selected according to the first user operation, (iii) the operation receiving unit detects the operational button being released (after the detection of the user pushing the operational button) as a second user operation, and (iv) in response to the second user operation being received, the forwarding unit transmits the piece of reception information requested and received from the program selecting apparatus, as recited in claim 1.

Additionally, the Applicants note that Sampsell teaches that the learning remote prompts the user to press a particular command on the original remote control when the learning remote is ready to receive the original command from the original remote (see paragraph [0053]).

However, this disclosure of Sampsell still is not a disclosure or suggestion of allowing the user to easily forward the piece of reception information of the selected program, received from the program selecting apparatus as a result of the first user operation selecting a program, to another apparatus, such that this forwarding is achieved by performing the first user operation (pushing the operational button of the apparatus) to cause the apparatus to receive the piece of reception information of the selected program from the program selecting apparatus, and then performing the second user operation (releasing the operational button of the informing unit), as required by claim 1.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that claim 1 provides the above-mentioned features by the user pressing and releasing the same operational button, whereas the features disclosed by Sampsell (which as described above are different from the features required by claim 1) can only be achieved by pressing different buttons on the learning remote and the original remote.

In other words, Sampsell requires different buttons on different remotes to be pushed in order to achieve a learning operation, whereas claim 1 allows above-mentioned distinguishing features (a)-(c) to be achieved by the simple pressing and releasing of the same button.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that claim 1 and claims 3-5, 8-10 and 16-18 that depend therefrom would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Knee and Sampsell.

Amended independent claims 11, 14 and 15 are directed to a system, a method, and a program, respectively and each recite features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 1. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 11, 14 and 15 are allowable over the prior art of record because claims 11, 14 and 15 recite the above-described features that are lacking from

Sampsell.

Regarding dependent claim 13, which was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sampsell in view of Hendricks and Krzyzanowski (secondary references), it is respectfully submitted these secondary references do not disclose or suggest the above-discussed features of independent claims 1, 11, 14 and 15 which are lacking from the Sampsell reference. Therefore, no obvious combination of Sampsell with the secondary references would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the invention recited independent claims 11, 14 and 15 and claim 13 that depends therefrom.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Sampsell, Knee, Hendricks and/or Krzyzanowski or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Sampsell, Knee, Hendricks and/or Krzyzanowski to obtain the invention of independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 11 14 and 15 and claims 3-5, 8-10, 13 and 16-18 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Tetsuji FUCHIKAMI et al.
/Andrew L. Dunlap/
By _____
2009.10.08 12:10:55 -04'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
October 8, 2009